

Applicant: Kari Juppi et al.
Application No.: 10/597,175
Response to Office action mailed Oct. 16, 2008
Response filed November 14, 2008

Remarks

Claims 36–53 remain pending in the application. Claims 13–35 have been canceled. In the Office action dated Oct. 16, 2008, claims 14–35 were rejected as obvious over Wolf et al. in view of Komulainen et al.

In response to the examiner's question with respect to the five Finnish search reports, applicant has found English language equivalents of the foreign references cited therein, except for DE 414097 for which an English machine translation from the European Patent Office website is provided. Only one reference (which was previously submitted) appears particularly relevant, namely Ilvespaa et al. (US, 5,865,955), FIG. 5, which is a better reference in some respects than Wolf et al. in that it shows impingement dryers where gases impinge directly on the web which is not shown by Wolf et al. which blows through a fabric. Schiel (US 5256257) might be mentioned, but shows impingement on only one side of the web, and the web is on a belt (impervious to water) coming from a tandem nip arrangement (same belt through two nips) which makes the under side of the web very wet—just what the claimed invention prevents. An Information Disclosure Statement is submitted with this response directed to the corresponding applications in English.

Cited Foreign patent	Corresponding application in English
Finnish search reports	or machine translation
FI 70739	US 4,154,645
FI 92728	US 4,830,709
FI 94880	US 5,064,502
FI 920082	US 5,256,257
FI 102623	US 5,865,955 (previously submitted)
FI 820727	GB 2094364
DE 414097	Machine translation provided
DE 3927597	CA 2,053,239

Applicant: Kari Juppi et al.
Application No.: 10/597,175
Response to Office action mailed Oct. 16, 2008
Response filed November 14, 2008

Ilvespaa et al. (US, 5,865,955), FIG. 5, shows only what the examiner considered was present in Wolf et al.—that is a pre-impingement dryer followed by a second impingement dryer, and so should not have any impact on the examiner's allowance of claim 36. Applicant has amended claim 36 based on ¶ [0023] of the specification to include a paper *or board web* and to include the range of first dryer cylinder temperatures which includes the temperature appropriate for board webs in accordance with ¶ [0023]. The term “a group of steam heated dryer cylinders” has been amended to—a *first* group of steam heated dryer cylinders—for greater clarity as referenced in dependent claims. Claim 36 has also been amended to clarify the antecedent bases with respect to “steam heated dryer[[s]] cylinders” and “the drying surface of [[a]] the first dryer cylinder”.

Claim 42 is an apparatus claim based on claim 36 as amended, and therefore should also be allowable. Applicant has added dependent method claims 37–41, and dependent apparatus claim 43–53 based on the canceled dependent claims which further nonobviously limit the method of claim 36 and the apparatus of claim 42 in combination with the claims from which they depend.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res

November 14, 2008 (12:19pm)